

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/802,735	03/18/2004	Yutaka Takafuji	1035-501	5007
23117	7590 02/23/2006		EXAMINER	
	VANDERHYE, PC	TRAN, THIEN F		
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22203			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2811	
		DATE MAILED: 02/23/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		SV			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/802,735	TAKAFUJI ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Thien F. Tran	2811			
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stranger of the period for reply will be stranger o	DATE OF THIS COMMUN R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO atute, cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1	7 January 2006.				
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ 1	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
 Since this application is in condition for allo closed in accordance with the practice under 	•	·			
Disposition of Claims					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,3-15,17-32 and 43-55</u> is/are penda 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>6-8,11,17-32 and</u> 5) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>54 and 55</u> is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,3-5,12-15,51 and 52</u> is/are rejectory Claim(s) <u>9,10 and 53</u> is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	43-50 is/are withdrawn from	consideration.			
Application Papers					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ a	accepted or b)⊡ objected to	by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Bur * See the attached detailed Office action for a	ents have been received. ents have been received in A priority documents have beer reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)					
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB, Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 01/17/2006 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 51 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yasukawa (JP 2001-255559).

Yasukawa discloses the claimed semiconductor device (Figs 4-8) comprising an insulating substrate (10) having a surface on which a first SiO₂ film (12) is formed; a single crystal silicon thin film (210e, 401) bonded with the insulating substrate on a partial region of the insulating substrate; and a non-single crystal silicon thin film (210d, 1a) on the insulating substrate in a region where the single-crystal silicon thin film (210e, 401) is not bonded with the insulating substrate, wherein the single crystal silicon thin film (401) has a substantially uniform thickness and has a surface

Application/Control Number: 10/802,735

Art Unit: 2811

substantially free of damage, the single crystal silicon thin film has bonded thereto a second SiO₂ film (210b), the surface of the insulating substrate, where the first SiO₂ film is formed, is bonded with the single crystal silicon thin film, where the second SiO₂ film is formed, and the single crystal silicon thin film (401) and non single crystal silicon thin film (1a) are separated from one another (see Fig. 6).

The claim limitations "formed by PECVD deposition, or PECVD deposition followed by crystallization" and "formed as separate layers" in claims 1 and 51 are taken to be product by process limitations. A product by process claim directed to the product per se, no matter how actually made, In re Hirao, 190 USPQ 15 at 17 (footnote 3). See In re Fessman, 180 USPQ 324, 326 (CCPA 1974); In re Marosi et al., 218 USPQ 289. 292 (Fed. Cir. 1983); and particularly In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985), all of which make it clear that it is the patentability of the final structure of the product "gleaned" from the process steps, which must be determined in a "product by process" claim, and not the patentability of the process. See also MPEP 2113. Moreover, an old and obvious product produced by a new method is not a patentable product, whether claimed in "product by process" claims or not. In the final structure, the non-single crystal silicon thin film formed by PECVD deposition in the present invention is a polycrystalline silicon film which is the same polycrystalline silicon thin film (1a) disclosed by Yasukawa. Therefore, the non single crystal silicon thin film as claimed does not result in a structural difference between the claim invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claim invention from the prior art.

Regarding claim 3, the single crystal silicon thin film 210e has a thickness of 55nm.

Regarding claim 5, the non-single crystal silicon thin film (210d, 1a) comprises polycrystalline silicon.

Regarding claim 52, transistor elements are formed from the single crystal silicon thin film

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasukawa (JP 2001-255559).

Yasukawa as described above does not specifically disclose the single crystal silicon thin film 210e having a thickness of not more than about 20 nm. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the thickness of the single crystal silicon thin film having the claimed range of thickness to reduce the device size as small as possible, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

Art Unit: 2811

Claims 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasukawa (JP 2001-255559) in view of Yale (EP 0 559 389).

Yasukawa as described above does not explicitly disclose the insulating substrate being a high-strain-point glass including an alkaline earth alumino borosilicate glass. Yale discloses a high-strain-point glass as a material for a substrate in liquid crystal display devices. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the glass substrate of Yasukawa of the high-strain-point glass disclosed by Yale in order to provide a glass substrate capable of withstanding elevated temperatures and improving the resistance of the glass to chemical attack by reagents.

Regarding claim 13, Yale discloses the insulating substrate being made of barium-alumino borosilicate glass.

Regarding claim 14, Yasukawa in view of Yale disclose the same structure as claimed wherein the insulating substrate and the single crystal silicon thin film have the same materials as those used in the instant invention. Therefore, it is inherent that the structure of Yasukawa in view of Yale provides the same characteristics as claimed wherein a difference of linear expansion between the insulating substrate and the single crystal silicon thin film is about not more than 250 ppm at temperatures in a range between substantially room temperature and 600°C.

Regarding claim 15, the insulating substrate as taught by Yale has the same materials as the material used for the insulating substrate in the instant invention. These

Art Unit: 2811

materials for the insulating substrate are inherently high-strain-point glasses whose strain point is not less than 500°C.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 54 and 55 are allowed.

Claims 9, 10 and 53 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Reference A is being cited since it shows a polysilicon film 17a formed by PECVD method.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thien F. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-1665. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM - 5:00PM Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie C. Lee can be reached on (571) 272-1732. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Application/Control Number: 10/802,735 Page 7

Art Unit: 2811

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

tt

February 17, 2006

THIENTRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER